- as Trustee for JEPHSON FAMILY TRUST; RANDALL R. RUCH as Trustee for SCHUYKILL VALLEY SPORTING GOODS, INC. PROFIT SHARING PLAN; 3 GERALD WILLIAMS as Trustee for SCHUYKILL VALLEY SPORTING GOODS, INC. PROFIT SHARING PLAN; 4 JAY SCHAEFFER, VICTOR ALAN 5 PERRY as Trustee for VICTOR ALAN PERRY, LLC DEFINED BENEFIT PENSION PLAN; and SHARLENE JONES as executor for IRENE S. K. CHUN (deceased). Plaintiffs. 8 9 VS. RONALD E. OSBORN; BRENT P. 10 OSBORN: OSBORN DEVELOPMENT, 11 CO., LLC, a Nevada limited liability company, RV & YACHT I, LLC, a Nevada 12 limited liability company; BILL BOOTH; LAVONE BOOTH; GENE E. 13 MCCLELLAND as Trustee for MCCLELLAND LIVING TRUST; PATRICIA L. MCCLELLAND as Trustee 14 for MCCLELLAND LIVING TRUST; 15 GEORGE C. SCHUMACHER; TERRY ANNE SCHUMACHER; DUANE E. FLESHMAN; JOHNNIE M. FLESHMAN; 16 STACY L. DOUTRE as custodian for 17 DERREK M. DOUTRE; RAJEN N. BHATT; GIENO V. MOTL; JOANNE
- JUDY E. HIGGS; KELVIN R. LAIRD; 19 ROBERT J. FRICKE as Successor Trustee of 20 the FRICKE 2001 FAMILY TRUST; DARLENE LUSTER; DEBRA LYNN HORTON; HAZEL M. SIMMONS; 21 MARJORIE M. JONES; CHARLES E. 22 SLAVIN as Trustee for SLAVIN FAMILY REVOCABLE TRUST; PATRICIA E. 23 SLAVIN as Trustee for SLAVIN FAMILY REVOCABLE TRUST; PETER ALBERT JEPHSON; ETHEL G. JEPHSON; 24 CHARLES G. GELTZ, JR.; LOA JEAN 25 GELTZ; STEPHEN F. GIES; SHARON GIES; RICHARD P. ASH as Trustee for

TOMASIEWICZ; PEGGY LAKEY; RODGER LAKEY; WILLIAM T. HIGGS;

FAMILY TRUST; MARY L. ASH as Trustee for RICHARD P. AND MARY L. ASH 1990 FAMILY TRUST; GEORGE M.

RICHARD P. AND MARY L. ASH 1990

28 DIXON as Trustee for DIXON ELECTRIC

1	PENSION PLAN TRUST; JENNIFER
2	HICKOK; VERONICA DORRIE as Trustee for VERONICIA DORRIE TRUST;
_	JEANNE W. KEITH; RAY K. KEITH;
3	HENRY L. CLARK as Trustee for HENRY
	L. CLARK AND ROBERTA L. CLARK
4	1993 FAMILY TURST; ROBERTA L.
_	CLARK as Trustee for HENRY L. CLARK
5	AND ROBERTA L. CLARK 1993 FAMILY TURST; JENNIFER R. HICKOK; C/F
6	JAMISON LEIGH LUNDEMO; CAROL E.
O	PORTA as Trustee for CAROL R. PORTA
7	REVOCABLE TRUST; GAYLE
	ROBINSON; MICHAEL JOHN
8	PONTRELLI as Trustee for PONTRELLI
_	FAMILY TRUST; NORMA JEAN
9	PONTRELLI as Trustee for PONTRELLI FAMILY TRUST; JONATHAN EDWARD
10	ARNOW as Trustee for TESSA ARNOW
LO	TRUST; CLYDE R. BROWN as Trustee for
11	BROWN FAMILY TRUST; SHARAN L.
	BROWN as Trustee for BROWN FAMILY
12	TRUST; CYNTHIA G. DAVIS as Trustee
1 2	for SECONDED AMENDED CYNTHIA G.
13	DAVIS LIVING TRUST DATED JULY 1, 2004; TRACE W. GEIL; MARY A.
L 4	GIANNOTTI as Trustee for GIANNOTTI
	FAMILY BYPASS TRUST CREATED
15	UNDER THE GIANNOTTI 1990
	REVOCABLE TRUST DATED OCTOBER
L 6	23, 1990; BEVERLY WALLACE; LOIS G.
L7	ROBINSON; JOHN R. LINDELL as Trustee for LINDELL'S PAINTING SERVICE
L /	MONEY PURCHASE PENSION PLAN
18	AGREEMENT; BARBARA A. LINDELL as
	Trustee for LINDELL'S PAINTING
L 9	SERVICE MONEY PURCHASE PENSION
	PLAN AGREEMENT; SHERRI KEY as
20	Trustee for LINDELL'S PAINTING SERVICE MONEY PURCHASE PENSION
21	PLAN AGREEMENT; ANGELIQUE
	CLARK as Trustee for CETUS
22	MORTGAGE; and STOREY COUNTY,
	NEVADA
23	D 0 1 .
24	Defendants.
4	
25	,
-	'

Plaintiffs make this motion in accordance with F.R.Bankr.P. 9019 seeking an order approving the compromise and settlement of disputed litigation. This motion is based upon the following discussion of facts and law. Plaintiffs also request the Court take judicial

28

26

notice of the papers and pleadings on file in the main Cetus Mortgage Ltd. case.

1	
Τ	4

BACKGROUND

- 1. Prior to filing this bankruptcy case, Cetus Mortgage, Ltd. ("CETUS") was a licensed mortgage broker, ostensibly in compliance with NRS 645B. CETUS acted as a mortgage broker which arranged loans between private lenders and borrowers.
- 2. In or around May of 2007, one or more CETUS representatives contacted various private lenders to fund a loan to Ronald E. Osborn, Brent P. Osborn, hereinafter referred to as "the Osborns" and including Osborn Development Co. LLC.
- 3. Plaintiffs, also referred to herein as THE FIRST RV PARK LENDERS, agreed to fund a \$1,700,000 loan to Defendant Osborn Development Co. LLC. ("FIRST LOAN"). Security for repayment of the loan was 10 acres of unimproved real property within the Tahoe Reno Industrial Park in Storey County, Nevada (the "Property").
- 4. THE FIRST RV PARK LENDERS based their decision to fund the \$1.7 million FIRST LOAN to the Osborns on many factors, including the development proposed for the Property, the terms of the loan, and the recommendations of CETUS representative Marcilyn Benvin.
- 5. On or about May 17, 2007, Defendants OSBORN DEVELOPMENT CO. LLC, RONALD E. OSBORN and BRENT P. OSBORN executed a Promissory Note in favor of FIRST RV PARK LENDERS ("FIRST NOTE"). Pursuant to the terms of the FIRST NOTE, OSBORN DEVELOPMENT CO. LLC and THE OSBORNS promised to pay the principal sum of \$1,700,000 plus interest at the rate of 10% per annum to the FIRST RV PARK LENDERS. According to the terms of the FIRST NOTE, payments of interest only were to be paid commencing June 30, 2007, and continuing through May 31, 2008, at which time the entire unpaid balance plus accrued interest was immediately due and payable.
- 6. Repayment of the FIRST NOTE is secured by a deed of trust ("FIRST DEED OF TRUST") encumbering 10 acres of unimproved real PROPERTY ("the PROPERTY").

 THE FIRST DEED OF TRUST was recorded May 31, 2007 in the official records of Storey County, Nevada as document 106796.

7. On May 31, 2007, the FIRST RV PARK LENDERS obtained a lenders' policy of insurance from FIRST AMERICAN TITLE INSURANCE COMPANY insuring the FIRST DEED OF TRUST in senior position on the PROPERTY.

CCRS AND RECORD OF SURVEY

- 8. On October 4, 2007, THE OSBORNS recorded a Declaration of Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions ("CCRs") purporting to restrict and condition the use of the PROPERTY. The CCRs were recorded in the official records of Storey County, Nevada as document 107749.
- 9. On November 19, 2007, THE OSBORNS recorded a Record of Survey and the Provisions, Dedications, Easements and Notes ("Record of Survey") against the PROPERTY. The Record of Survey was recorded in the official records of Storey County, Nevada as document 108015.
- 10. The intended purpose of the Record of Survey was to 'divide' the PROPERTY into 254 separate assessors parcels and to utilize a series of those parcels as collateral for additional loans brokered through CETUS.
- 11. The Storey County Assessor improperly, and without statutory authority, permitted THE OSBORNS to record the Record of Survey.
- 12. The Storey County Assessor placed certain obligations on THE OSBORNS to take certain steps and to do certain things within the 12 month period following November 19, 2007. None of those requirements were met by THE OSBORNS.
- 13. On March 20, 2008, Defendant OSBORN DEVELOPMENT, LLC executed a deed transferring title to the PROPERTY to Defendant RV & YACHT, I, LLC. The deed was recorded in the official records of Storey County, Nevada as document 108654.
- 14. On or about April 18, 2008, Defendant RV & YACHT I, LLC, with the assistance of CETUS, but without the consent or knowledge of the FIRST RV PARK LENDERS, attempted to subdivide the PROPERTY into different parcels.
- 15. Defendant RV & YACHT I, LLC sought additional financing through CETUS which resulted in additional loans in the aggregate amount of \$2,075,000 from various

authorizes a trustee, upon court approval, to enter into settlement agreements. Settlement

& C Properties, 784 F.2d 1377, 1381 (9th Cir. 1986, cert. denied sub nom. Martin v.

Robinson, 479 U.S. 854 (1986). The four criteria are: (1) probability of success in the

collection; and (4) the paramount interest of creditors and a proper deference to their

the numerous questions of law and fact that may be raised regarding the settlement, but

on the merits of the claim or a bankruptcy judge's independent investigation into the

litigation; (2) the complexity of the litigation involved and the expense, inconvenience, and

delay necessarily attending it; (3) the difficulties, if any, to be encountered in the matter of

reasonable views in the premises. The responsibility of the bankruptcy judge is not to decide

rather to canvass the issues and see whether the settlement falls below the lowest point in the

range of reasonableness. In re Energy Co-op, Inc. 886 F.2d 921 (7th Cir. 1989). A mini-trial

underlying dispute is not required. In re Walsh Construction, Inc., 669 F.2d 1325 (9th Cir.

agreements in bankruptcy cases are reviewed under the criteria set forth in the case of In re A

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

1982).

1. Probability of success in the litigation

One of the difficulties encountered in the litigation is the unavailability of Marcilyn Benvin as a witness. Although the PLAINTIFFS and the DEFENDANTS received lender's policies of insurance for their respective secured positions, questions regarding the role of CETUS and Benvin and whether they were acting in the capacity as agent for the lenders created disputed issues of fact. A legal determination of that question was, and is, difficult to predict and creates substantial uncertainty for the parties.

2. The complexity of the litigation involved and the expense, inconvenience, and delay necessarily attending it

Due to the number of parties, this litigation is potentially very expensive and likely more expensive than the value of the PROPERTY. Depositions of all of the individual lenders would be costly and would likely take many months to complete. In turn, trial would be lengthy if most or all of the parties were called to testify. As in any litigation, adverse

28

1	ruling for either the plaintiffs or the defendants could lead to appeals and more expense and
2	delay.
3	3. The difficulties, if any, to be encountered in the matter of collection
4	This is not considered to be a factor in the analysis.
5	4. The paramount interest of creditors and a proper deference to their
6	reasonable views in the premises
7	Unfortunately, this is not a situation which will generate significant funds for the
8	bankruptcy estate and the creditors. The CETUS trustee does hold a very small portion of
9	the FIRST NOTE and FIRST DEED OF TRUST. It does, however, resolve a major
10	problem involving several million dollars of loans brokered by CETUS and indirectly may
11	provide the Trustee with an additional basis to object to proofs of claims filed by various
12	lenders against the bankruptcy estate, thereby enhancing the return to creditors with allowed,
13	unsecured claims.
14	CONCLUSION
15	Based upon the foregoing, PLAINTIFFS request an order approving the settlement
16	and, if necessary, directing the clerk to execute reconveyances as provided by F.R.Bankr.P.
17	70.
18	DATED this 20th day of January, 2012.
19	HARTMAN & HARTMAN
20	
21	/S/ Jeffrey L. Hartman Jeffrey L. Hartman, Esq. Attorney for Plaintiffs
22	Attorney for Plaintiffs
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	